

DEVELOPING MANAGEMENT COMPETENCE

DR. HANS C. BLAISE

INDIAN INSTITUTE OF PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION
NEW DELHI
1973

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMPETENCE

Hans C. Blaise*

"Government has ceased to be merely the keeper of the peace, the arbiter of disputes, and the provider of common services. For better or worse, government has directly and indirectly become a principal innovator, a major determiner of social and economic priorities, the guide as well as the guardian of social values, the capitalist and entrepreneur or subsidizer and guarantor of most new enterprises of great scale"(1)

In the decade of the 70's management(2) competence could well prove to be one of the most critical of the scarce resources in developing countries. More progress has been made in the area of development planning competence than is true for the ability to implement development projects. The technological and professional knowledge and skills in fields ranging from family planning and education to agriculture and industry have developed faster than the management competence necessary to design and carry out action programs. Although the shortage of personnel with management skills is found in both the public and the private sector, it is in the public sector that this shortage is particularly acute. A recent meeting of economic planners of the ECAFE region was

* Advisor on Development Administration, the Ford Foundation, Philippines.

only one of the many occasions where reference was made to the "implementation gap", to the inadequacy of translating plan targets into effective means of carrying out development programs and projects. At the meeting the lack of administrative capability was cited as a major obstacle to target achievement.⁽³⁾

It can hardly be suggested that the field of public administration has been a neglected area in the development efforts of most countries. Schools of public administration, government training institutes and centers have mushroomed in the developing countries over the past two decades. Hundreds of foreign experts have assisted developing country governments in their administrative reforms efforts.⁽⁴⁾ Yet, the results of the government reform and modernization efforts are on the whole disappointing, the actual contributions of most of the schools of public administration to the improvement of performance in the public sector has at best been marginal, and government agencies continue to have a severe shortage of management personnel capable of guiding development programs and projects to their effective completion. The government services of most countries still have a long way to go to develop the capability required to perform the innovative and entrepreneurial role referred to in the above quote from Frederick Mosher.

It will be suggested here that there is a need to reexamine the concerns of public administration as a professional field. To make a more viable and significant contribution to the development efforts, more attention must be devoted in public administration research, training and consultation to the actual management problems, processes and techniques of substantive government programs. "In plain language, the focus of action in development administration must be upon actual development programmes"⁽⁵⁾ I do not want to go into the somewhat sterile argument about the difference between public administration and development administration here. I do want to suggest, however, that scholars and practitioners of public administration need to focus much more on the management of concrete programs in agriculture, education, family planning and other critical development areas than has been the case in the past. Although the ideas expressed here are primarily based on my observations in Southeast Asia, many of the points made will apply to other parts of the world as well.

Administration as an end-in-itself

On the surface, the statement that administration is a means to an end sounds like stating the obvious. One's immediate reaction to this statement would almost certainly

be that 'obviously' administration is a set of functions, processes, and techniques for the accomplishment of the objectives and targets of an organization. Yet, if we look at the reality of the concerns, the research and writings, the teaching and professional activities of those who are considered professionals in the field of public administration, then we frequently find that their focus is on administration per se, without any direct relationship to substantive action programs. When we examine the curricula of public administration schools and training institutes we find that the teaching is almost entirely devoted to administrative functions (e.g. personnel management, financial administration), to administrative procedures and techniques (office management, O & M) and to an understanding of the administrative culture (the bureaucracy, organization behavior, the political system, etc.). More recently, the analysis of the policy making process has become an additional popular area. By far the majority of the education and training programs devote little attention to the integration and application of the administrative functions and techniques to the management of actual substantive operating programs. To a certain extent, therefore, it can be said that the emphasis in education and training is on the means, and that the means - ends relationship that is only evident

in the examination of the application of the administrative functions and techniques to concrete action systems receives little attention. One might say that public administration research and teaching suffers from 'horizontalism', from an excess of concern with the internal elements of administrative structure, processes, and techniques and a lack of emphasis on the 'vertical' dimension of the management and operation of social and economic program areas.

Not only at public administration education centers but also in professional practice public administration specialists have concerned themselves more with administrative forms and practices than with the application of knowledge about administration to government action programs. A clear example of this can be found in the foreign technical assistance programs of the UN, of AID, and of foundations. Ten years ago, Weidner pointed out in an article that "very little interest has been shown in functional ministries by the administration experts attached to foreign assistance projects"⁽⁶⁾ Eight years later, Esman and Montgomery stated that "the public administration groups in AID have had only minor influence on the important administrative component of... substantive projects [in education, public works, health and similar fields]"⁽⁷⁾. The emphasis of the public administration specialists has been on broad

administrative reform and on the introduction of new technologies like personnel classification systems, PPBS, and the like. Seldom have they been focused on the analysis, design and guidance of the administrative structures, processes and techniques that would further the implementation of development programs in a given program area.

A well-known phenomenon in bureaucratic organizations is "goal displacement", which occurs when "adherence to the rules originally conceived as a means, becomes transformed into an end-in-itself"⁽⁸⁾. The public administration literature is full of examples of this tendency among cautious government officials who, by dogmatic compliance with the established norms and rules, protect themselves and their position, even while in the process they block attempts at innovation and may severely hamper the pursuit of the targets and objectives of their organization⁽⁹⁾. It would appear, however, that the very scholars and professional experts in public administration who have analyzed and bemoaned the "goal displacement" tendencies in the public bureaucracy have themselves contributed and continue to contribute to this evil.

The displacement of goals not only take place when the bureaucratic norms and rules, the proscriptions in the General Orders, become more important than the values and purposes for which an organization was created. It can equally

result from a narrow focus on functions and techniques in administration, divorced from the reality context of specific organizations and programs. Weidner has said that "public administration has glorified the means and forgotten the ends. Good administration and good human relations have become ends in themselves, quite apart from the achievement of other values that they may or may not facilitate"⁽¹⁰⁾. In other words, "goal displacement" is not only expressed in the rigid adherence to rules by the officials of organizations, it can also be found in the functional and technological focus of the public administration experts.

A factor that has contributed to the concern of public administrators with the internal functions and processes is the perception of the role of the public servant. The idea that the public servant's primary if not exclusive concern is with the implementation of programs, with faithfully carrying out the policy decisions of their political masters frequently still prevails. In the 1967 edition of their famous textbook, Pfiffner and Presthus still define public administration as "the coordination of individual and group efforts to carry out public policy. It is mainly occupied with the routine work of government" (emphasis added)⁽¹¹⁾. The same idea I have often heard expressed in university lecture halls and at conferences in developing countries.

The practicing higher civil servants are fully aware of the influence they can and do exert on both policy and program decisions of government. Decision on basic objectives and the final decision on policy and program matters may not be theirs. Political leaders could not function, however, without the strategic planning by career civil servants of economic and social programs that will further basic objectives, without their creative and systematic analysis of action alternatives, and without their calculation of probable consequences of action alternatives.

The clear separation of policy and administration is a myth and the concept of public administration as being primarily concerned with the routine work of government a dysfunctional orientation. It is both more realistic and more positive to recognize that the public administrator has an entrepreneurial and managerial role in government, albeit that he is bounded by the policy determination and decision-making powers that are vested in his political superiors. The creative, entrepreneurial and decision-making role of the public administrator as a manager warrants more attention than it has had in the past. This is particularly important with regard to the planning and management of economic and social development programs.

The contribution of management specialists

As stated earlier, public administration experts have not shown much interest in the management and administration problems involved in the operation of substantive development programs. Very little research has been conducted on the administrative aspects of programs in fields like agriculture, health, education, etc.⁽¹²⁾. Given the lack of attention paid to program administration and the lack of demonstrated capability of public administrators in solving the concrete management problems faced by officials responsible for carrying out action programs in these substantive fields, it is not surprising that "those of us who have a vested interest in public administration technical assistance have not been able to convince those who exercise "real bureaucratic" power that we have a valid body of knowledge which is useful in the development process"⁽¹³⁾. In theory, it is certainly true that "a highly skilled specialist in some profession is not ipso facto a good administrator"⁽¹⁴⁾. It is, however, up to the public administration specialist to demonstrate that he is capable of making a unique and relevant contribution to the functioning of an organization in a given field. He must be able to show in practice that his contribution will help the man who is responsible for

getting results in his program area, and who may not himself have any specialized knowledge about administration.

By far the majority of organizations, departments and agencies are headed by people whose professional preparation has been in a field other than administration. They may be lawyers or doctors, engineers, educators or history majors. It would be unrealistic to aspire to having all management and administrative positions become the exclusive domain of those who are professionally trained for such positions. Apart from, or even more than, functioning in a management capacity as such, the management specialist can render staff assistance and consultative services to the managers and administrators who are responsible for organizations, departments and programs but whose formal training in administration and management is limited.

Clearly, the management professional must have a demonstrable substantive competence, a unique body of knowledge that the de facto manager is convinced will help him to solve the problems he faces. If the head of an agricultural extension service, of a family planning organization, or of an economic planning department fails to call upon the services of a public administration specialist, then this is not necessarily because these executives are too proud or that they fail to recognize the

needs of their organization. Even executives who have called on the advice of lawyers, economists, and statisticians may not call on management and administration specialists to assist them in the analysis of their management problems. And, if they call on such an expert, it is more likely to seek advice on a limited technical problem like record keeping or personnel practices. Could it be that the public administration profession has thus far failed to show that it has the capability to contribute to concrete problems of program management?

Program Management

Both expertise and recognition can be gained if the public administration fraternity would systematically focus its attention on program management. By program management I mean the planning, design and operation of action systems for the pursuit of specified objectives. It involves the making of allocative decisions or choice among alternative structures and processes of action. This, in turn, requires the systematic collection and analysis of pertinent data for decision-making. In program management, the administrator continues to be concerned with functional areas like personnel management and financial administration, but he will analyze and apply his knowledge about administrative functions, as well as his knowledge about administrative

functions, as well as his knowledge about administrative techniques, about organization behavior, etc. to the problem at hand of achieving results in family planning organizations, in public works programs, in crop diversification programs and the like. "The problem in development administration" as Weidner states, "is to get results, not how to conform to a predetermined set of criteria of rationality"⁽¹⁵⁾. Public administrators may have been overly concerned with "across-the-board changes", with drastic changes in personnel practices of the entire civil service, with the reorganization of whole ministries if not the entire government⁽¹⁶⁾. Their contribution to economic and social development may be more effective if they concentrate their efforts on "a few large or otherwise important projects or programs and concentrate on improving administration to the extent required to facilitate the preparation, execution and operation of these projects and programs"⁽¹⁷⁾.

Any development program or project requires the coordination of many resources. Physical resources must be available at the proper time and place. Alternative allocations among program elements must be considered to determine the optimum combination to achieve the desired results. The activities of many specialists and professionals need to be coordinated. An effective communication system must be set up both to guide action and to provide the data

necessary for planning, monitoring and evaluation. All of this must take place not in an abstract world of administrative rationality, but in the real world of specific programs with specified goals and objectives as the desired end-state.

The question may legitimately be asked whether the engineer is not better prepared to decide on the management and resource allocation decisions of a highway construction program than someone whose professional preparation is in administration. Or, it may be asked whether a physician is not better qualified to make decisions regarding a family planning program than is a management specialist. The answer to this can be given in three parts:

1. There is an increasingly extensive, complex and precise body of knowledge about the elements, methods and techniques of analysis and decision-making relevant to the structuring of an action system designed to pursue social and economic objectives. The management professional has acquired this specialized knowledge and is able to make a unique complementary contribution to the technical and professional considerations that guide the choices and decisions made by engineers, physicians and other professionals in their work.

2. The programmatic considerations going into the planning and execution within any given substantive area are not limited to the professional elements for which the engineer, the agronomist, the physician or educator have been trained. Any action program requires the coordination and reconciliation of professional inputs provided by people with a variety of professional skills and backgrounds. Thus, the family planning organization manager has to integrate and reconcile the contributions to the program made by communications and promotion specialists with those of physicians operating clinics. The highway program manager must relate the legal and financial aspects of land acquisition to the construction requirements. The professional manager, if he is well prepared, is qualified to guide the analysis of these multiple professional contributions, to determine the manner in which the various inputs and activities can be coordinated over time to optimize resource allocation and target achievement.

3. Frequently, development projects are not an end-in-themselves, they are a means to an end. To the highway engineer, the target or end-product of a road construction project is likely to be the physical construction of the road. To the development planner, however, the construction of that road is an improvement in the means of communication,

providing access to the market for farm products, stimulating the geographic distribution of industrial production, or whatever the ultimate objective may be.

Program management in terms of development administration, contrary to the more intermediate concerns of the highway engineer, involves analysis and action design of any project in the context of the larger system and the ultimate rather than the intermediate objective. Thereby, the development administrator engaged in program management will provide not only the internal management and coordination guidance for the execution of programs and projects, but also link these programs and projects to related programs and activities, to a system of interdependent projects that in their complementarity lead to the desired results.

The "integrationist" administrator

The above are three significant areas in which public administration, through a focus on program management, can make a more significant contribution than it has made to the development process in the past. What is called for in development administration is what Bertram Gross has called "integrating generalists"⁽¹⁸⁾. Gross referred to that breed of administrators as people who "are looked to

for skills not only in communication and compromise, but in the integration of divergent interests. They are expected to understand the organization's broad environment as well as, or even more than, its internal workings.

They are expected to know enough about the relevant techniques to enable them to understand, evaluate, and coordinate the activities of many specialists and professionals"⁽¹⁹⁾

The term "integrating generalist", which Gross uses to distinguish the new administrator from the traditional "gentleman generalist"⁽²⁰⁾, is somewhat misleading. Gross is certainly not using the term "generalist" in the sense of an erudite person with a broad, general liberal arts education. An example of what he means by "generalist" is given in a recent UN publication, prepared by him and a number of his colleagues. In that publication it is stated that "the development administrator requires a thorough working knowledge of his own society in all its principal dimensions" and continues to list no less than sixteen of those "dimensions", ranging from agriculture and business to labor, natural resources, religion, science and technology⁽²¹⁾.

It is unquestionably true that the complexity of the development process as such, the scientific and technological advances made in health, agriculture, engineering, etc.,

as well as the technological advances in the field of management itself are rapidly changing the character and the knowledge requirements of managers. The professional manager of the 70's needs to develop the skill to discern the administrative elements and requirements in substantive program areas with the professional and technological content of which he is at best vaguely familiar. He must have the ability to design the most appropriate interaction among dissimilar professional fields, each with their own requirements, preferences and priorities. He must be master of the analytical methods and tools that will make it possible to construct an effective action system. He must be able to analyze, guide and design the interdependencies of his own project or program with those operating in the environment. Using the term in a somewhat different manner from the way it is used today, one might say that the manager of development programs needs to be a systems analyst and systems manager.

Professional Education

At this time, particularly in the developing countries, there is neither the systematic knowledge available, nor are there the training programs needed for the kind of management specialists referred to. There is an urgent

need for scholars and researchers in administration to analyze the management and administration dimensions of substantive action programs. Although management specialists correctly hold that the functions and processes of administrative analysis, decision-making and design do not vary fundamentally from one area of activity to another, there are yet technological and action requirement differences between for instance an agricultural extension service and a public works department. Only a series of analyses of action programs in the respective specialized fields will provide the management specialists with the insights and the substantive knowledge required to render effective services to the different professional areas.

With regard to education and training, considerably more emphasis will need to be placed on the development of the ability to apply the functions, methods and technology of administration to substantive program areas than is presently the case. For one this means the teaching of program and project management, both with regard to training in program management for development fields of particular importance, and as a general approach to the analysis and design of administrative action required in the planning and execution of development programs. This teaching needs to be related to actual cases and situations. It must be a

practical approach, exposing the students to both case analyses and exercises in the application of analytical methods, in decision-making, in organization design, in the design of management information and reporting systems, etc. Program management should be taught as the integrating entity in which the various elements, functions and techniques of administration are brought together in an action system.

The management education and training to be provided is necessarily of different kinds and at different levels. It is not enough to think only in terms of the university-level programs that offer courses leading to a degree in public administration. In reality, the schools, institutes and departments of public administration in all countries supply only a small percentage of the management personnel in the public sector. The development of management competence needs to be carried out through three kinds of programs: (a) within university-level programs in public administration, (b) in connection with inservice government training programs for management personnel, and (c) as part of the education and training programs for professionals in fields like public health, education, public works, agricultural services and other government program areas in which substantive program specialists tend to assume management responsibilities.

It is up to the faculty members at the schools and institutes of public administration to develop and demonstrate their competence in program management. Thereby, the schools of public administration and their staff members will be in a better position to prepare the managers and management specialists of the future. As schools and through their graduates they will also serve as a resource for management training personnel for in-service training programs and for developing the management competence of substantive program specialists.

Management technology

As a corollary to the emphasis on program management, in fact, as, an indispensable part thereof, public administrators need to develop their competence in handling the analytical and decision-making techniques available to modern management. Even those who favor the introduction of sophisticated management technologies have argued that its introduction into the developing countries must be done with great care because "implicit in these technologies are attitudes toward the value of time, the integrity of objective data, the quality of interpersonal and intergroup relationships..."²²). There is a great deal of truth in this statement by Esman and Montgomery.

The same, however, applies to many of the modernizations that have been introduced into the developing world, from the modern factory to the birth control pill. In actual fact, there has also been a noticeable reluctance on the part of schools of public administration in the US to introduce modern management technology into their education programs. The schools of business administration are the centres where modern management techniques have been developed and where they have become an important ingredient in the education program.

My personal observation of management education and practices in Asia indicates that management technology is increasingly applied to business management, but is still rare in public administration. In each of the six Asian developing countries with which I am most familiar one or more of the schools of business administration teach systems analysis and related subject matter in analysis and decision-making. In not one of those countries do the schools of public administration count a specialist in modern management technology among their faculty members. In a way this is not surprising. The major schools of public administration in all those six countries were established with the technical assistance of similar schools in the US. As far as I have been able to ascertain,

only one of six US technical assistance projects at schools of public administration with which I am familiar in Asia had one technical assistance team member for a two-year period with specialized knowledge in management science. Moreover, most of the programs of the schools of public administration that were responsible for rendering the technical assistance did not themselves have any courses in management technology at the time the assistance was rendered.

Analytical techniques, including quantitative analysis, are an indispensable tool of program management. This does not mean just offering a course in statistics or mathematics. The quantitative methods and techniques are only tools. They must be taught in such a way and to the extent that they are necessary and useful to the manager. A mere course or two in statistics, without the simultaneous use of this analytical tool in other courses does not serve much purpose. Similarly, systems analysis and computer utilization are only tools and techniques. They are only useful and significant as they are applied to real-life situations. A danger arises when sophisticated technology becomes an end-in-itself. And here we are back to what was said earlier in this paper about administrative form, functions and techniques being ends-in-themselves. "Goal displacement" can just as readily be found in the gadgetry

of modern management technology as it can be found in rules and regulations. This, however, does not negate the usefulness of either administrative rules and regulations or management technology.

Conclusion

The extent to which the development aspirations of nations are reached and plan targets are accomplished depends largely on the management capability and entrepreneurship^{pre} found in government departments and semi-government organizations. "For better or worse" -- as Mosher puts it -- government is the principal innovator, major determiner of priorities, capitalist and entrepreneur in the development process. Yet, as Hahn-Been Lee and Aberlardo Samonte state in the introduction to Administrative Reforms in Asia, "in this era of change, the discipline and practice of public administration in Asia has not been marked by imagination and adaptibility" ... "it suffered from a narrow image of being only an instrument for the maintenance of the existing system of law and order" ... and "public administration has been too often divorced from the change in the larger society within which it operates"⁽²³⁾. Unquestionably, this same statement could be made for other parts of the world as well.

There is no simple prescription that would lead to a more dynamic, entrepreneurial, responsive and responsible government bureaucracy. Attitudes, habits, and patterns formed over generations, and frequently being remnants of a colonial era and a society in which government had a much more delimited role, are not changed easily. In the preceding pages only one possible and partial approach to the improvement of management within government has been suggested, namely a focus on and development of competence in program management. I have suggested that the emphasis on program management may hold more promise for administrative improvements in general and for the planning and execution of development programs in particular than continuing attempts at fundamental, government-wide reforms. The approach is partial because program management itself is constrained by the conditions and rules that govern the larger system of which a public sector program is a part. Nevertheless, improved management competence will enhance the administrative planning and execution of development programs in key areas and the analysis of the program management requirements will help to highlight the specific weaknesses in the larger system that hamper effective program execution.

It has not been the intention to imply that all public administration education should be directed toward program management. Certainly there continues to be a need to prepare functional specialists in personnel and financial administration, etcetera. Similarly, policy analysis and the other current concerns of public administration remain important. I suggest, however, that there has thus far been a lack of emphasis on strategic decision-making and on the management requirements of substantive program areas in the study and teaching of public administration. Adding this dimension to the concerns of the field of public administration will be a significant addition to the capability of public administration as a professional field and, thereby, contribute to the effectiveness of government operations.

In the foregoing I have argued that the public administration professionals must sharpen their tools of analysis and demonstrate more clearly the contribution they can make to the design of action systems, to the allocation of resources within those systems, to the coordination of the activities and contributions of many different professionals engaged in action programs, and to the linkage of programs and organizations with the environment. Only by developing unique and distinct

professional competence that are viewed by decision-makers and operating heads of organizations and programs as contributing to the achievement of their objectives will the public administration specialists be able to play a viable and possibly vital role in the development process.

Notes

1. Frederick C. Mosher, "The Public Service in the Temporary Society", Public Administration Review, Vol. XXXI (January/February 1971), P.48-49.
2. Both in usage and in the literature the terms 'management' and 'administration' tend to be used interchangeably. There is, however, a difference in connotation. Management implies direction and the ability to influence and/or control the organization and its environment. Administration, derived from the Latin word ministrar (to serve), implies a more passive role. In this article an attempt has been made to use the term management consistently for references to strategic decision-making and administration for references to the technical and support functions in the operation of organizations.
3. United Nations, Information Service, Bangkok; Press Release No. G/153/71, December 10, 1971.
4. Milton J. Esman and John D. Montgomery, in "Systems Approaches to Technical Cooperation; The Role of Development Administration", Public Administration Review, Vol. XXIX (September/October 1969), state on p. 514 that public administration projects in the AID program "have represented only seven per cent of technical cooperation expenditures in recent years". They add, however, that "it is impossible to estimate the undesignated public administration component of projects listed in education, public works, health, and similar substantive fields". According to the Public Administration Newsletter, United Nations, New York, Department of Economic and Social Affairs, Public Administration Division, No.41 (September 1971), p. 13, the UN's 1970 obligation for technical cooperation activities in public administration was \$4,172,604.
5. United Nations, Public Administration Newsletter, No.36 (January 1971), p. 9.
6. Edward W. Weidner, "Development Administration: A New Focus Research", in Ferrel Heady and Sybil L. Stokes (eds.), Papers in Comparative Public Administration, (Ann Arbor, Michigan: Institute of Public Administration, The University of Michigan, 1962), p. 102.
7. Milton J. Esman and John D. Montgomery, op. cit., p. 514.

8. Robert K. Merton et al. (eds.), Reader in Bureaucracy, (New York: Free Press, 1952), p. 365.
9. See e.g., B.B. Schaffer, "The Deadlock in Development Administration", in Colin Leys (ed.), Politics and Change in Developing Countries (London: Cambridge University Press, 1969), p. 419; and Anders Richter, "The Existentialist Executive", Public Administration Review, Vol. XXX (July/August 1970), p. 419.
10. Edward W. Weidner, op. cit., p. 103.
11. John M. Pfiffner and Robert Presthus, Public Administration (New York: The Ronald Press Company, 1967, 5th ed.), p.7.
12. Edward W. Weidner, op. cit., p. 102.
13. Garth N. Jones, "Failure of Technical Assistance in Public Administration Abroad", Journal of Comparative Administration, Vol. 2 (May 1970), p. 5.
14. George F. Gant, "A Note on Applications of Development Administration", Public Policy, Vol. XV (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1966), p. 205.
15. Edward W. Weidner, op. cit., p. 105.
16. Albert Waterston, Development Planning: Leassons of Experience, (Baltimore, Md.: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1965), p. 285.
17. Id.
18. Bertram R. Gross, "The Administration of Economic Development Planning: Principles and Fallacies", Studies in Comparative International Development, Vol. III, 5, 1967-68 (St. Louis, Mo.: Social Science Institute, Washington University), p.92.
19. Id.
20. Id.
21. United Nations, Appraising Administrative Capability for Development, (New York: United Nations, ST/TAO/M/46, 1969), p. 49.

22. Milton J. Esman and John D. Montgomery, op. cit., p. 518. We want to note, however, that Esman and Montgomery basically appear to agree with the need for emphasis on program management and management technology. They recommend a strengthening of American assistance in public administration by" (1) deemphasizing projects which aim solely at transferring auxiliary administrative techniques; (2) linking administration and applying modern management concepts and methods directly to the planning, organizing and management of substantive action programs; and (3) drawing more liberally on the expanding body of knowledge and research now available in development administration" (p. 514).
23. Hahn-Been Lee and Abelardo G. Samonte (eds.), Administrative Reforms in Asia, (Manila, the Philippines: Eastern Regional Organization of Public Administration (EROPA), 1970), p.1.
-

